

REMARKS

Claims 12-16 and 21-25 are now pending in the application. Claim 12 has been amended to make the claim more readable. Claims 24 and 25 have been added. Support for new claims 24 and 25 can be found, *inter alia*, in FIG. 2 and the discussion thereof.

Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating that claims 21-23 are allowed. Further, Applicants thank the Examiner for the interview on February 24, 2004.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by Kim et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,223,800 B1). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

With regard to claim 12, Applicants assert that Kim et al. fail to disclose an inspection unit that inspects a status and a position of land patterns on a mount tape during movement of the mount tape for bonding. Instead, Kim et al. disclose a camera located over a pumping device for monitoring a nozzle so as to allow an Ag epoxy to ejected to a precise application site in a lead frame (col. 3, lines 23-26); the lead frame being temporarily fixed to an Ag epoxy application table (col. 3, lines 17-21). Applicants assert that a camera that monitors a nozzle while a lead frame is temporarily fixed as disclosed in Kim et al. is not the same as an inspection unit that inspects a status and a position of land patterns on a mount tape during movement of the mount tape for bonding as recited in claim 12. For at least this reason, Applicants assert that Kim et al. fail to disclose each and every element of claim 12 and claim 12 is, therefore, allowable. Applicants respectfully request that the art grounds of rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Jin et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,765,277). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

With regard to claim 12, Applicants assert that Jin et al. fail to disclose an inspection unit that inspects a status and a position of land patterns on a mount tape during movement of the mount tape for bonding. Instead, Jin et al., with reference to Figs. 4 and 5, disclose a camera 46 installed over the stage 42 or 52 that confirms a location of a chip 47 or 57. After the chip 47 or 57 is confirmed, the chip 47 or 57 is moved under a bond head 43 or 53, respectively, which then bonds the chip 47 or 57 to a lead frame 45 (Col. 2, lines 16-25). In other words, the camera 46 disclosed the Jin et al. reference corresponds to the alignment table CCD camera 242 over the chip alignment stage 240 disclosed in FIG. 2 of the Specification. Applicants assert that a camera 46 that confirms a chip 47 or 57 location, the chip 47 or 57 later being bonded to a lead frame 45 or 55, as disclosed in Jin et al. is not the same as an inspection unit that inspects a status and a position of land patterns on a mount tape during movement of the mount tape for bonding as recited in claim 12. For at least this reason, Applicants assert that Jin et al. fail to disclose each and every element of claim 12 and claim 12 is, therefore, allowable. Applicants respectfully request that art grounds of rejection be withdrawn.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim et al. or Jin et al., as applied to claim 12, and further in view of Kim et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,838,061). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As disclosed above, neither Kim et al. or Jin et al. disclose an inspection unit that inspects a status and a position of land patterns on a mount tape during movement of the mount tape for bonding as recited in claim 12.

Kim '061 is directed to a method of making a semiconductor package bonded to a semiconductor chip. Kim '061 is also silent as to an inspection unit that inspects a status and a position of land patterns on a mount tape during movement of the mount tape for bonding as recited in claim 12. Instead, Kim '061 discloses a CCD camera that is used in aligning and arranging a semiconductor chip (Col. 4, lines 1-20). Therefore, Kim '061 cannot disclose or suggest an inspection unit as recited in claim 12. Claim 12 is not rendered obvious to one skilled in the art by Kim et al. in view of Jin et al. and in further view of Kim '061. Claim 13 is allowable at least because it depends from independent claim 12.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating that claims 14-16 are allowable and claim 21-23 are allowed. Applicants have not put claims 14-16 into independent form because they depend from independent claim 12 which Applicants have shown to be allowable.

Response to the Examiner's Advisory Action

Applicants disagree with the Examiner's suggestion that the claims merely represent intended use and that the further limitations of the inspection unit and bonding unit of claim 12 have little importance. Moreover, Applicants assert that the disclosures

of Jin et al., Kim et al. ('800), and Kim ('061), while including cameras, would have to be structurally modified to anticipate or make obvious the claim 12 limitations of the inspection unit and bonding unit. For at least this reason, Applicants assert that the intended use argument as stated by the Examiner, cannot appropriately be used as suggested by the Examiner.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact John A. Castellano at the telephone number of the undersigned below.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.17 and 1.136(a), the Applicants respectfully petition for a two (2) month extension of time for filing a response in connection with the present application, and the required fee of \$420.00 is attached

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-

0750 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17;
particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

HARNESS, DICKEY, & PIERCE, P.L.C.

By



John A. Castellano, Reg. No. 35,094
P.O. Box 8910
Reston, Virginia 20195
(703) 668-8000

JAC/RFS:ewd